IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

MONDAY, THE 12TH MARCH 2007 / 21ST PHALGUNA 1928

WP(C).No. 8061 of 2007(I)

PETITIONER:
---

1. K.G.NAVABJHAN,
   AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT, STATE SEED FARM,
   KONGAD, PALAKKAD DISTRICT.

2. RAMESAN M.T.,
   AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT, KRISHI BHAVAN,
   VALAPATTANAM, P.O.VALAPATTANAM, KANNUR DISTRICT.

3. C.MOHANAN, AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT,
   KRISHI BHAVAN, IRIKKUR, IRIKKUR P.O.,
   KANNUR DIST.

4. P.SUNDARAN,
   AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT, KRISHI BHAVAN,
   CHERUKAVE, P.O.AYIKKARAPADI, MALAPPURAM DIST.

5. K.M.MOHANAN,
   AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT,
   KRISHI BHAVAN, MATTOOL, MATTOOL NORTH P.O.,
   KANNUR DIST.

6. K.I.NAUSHAD,
   AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT, KRISHI BHAVAN,
   CLAPPARA, VARAVILA P.O., KARUNAGAPPALLY,
   KOLLAM DIST.

7. RAJENDRAN .R.,
   AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT, KRILSH BHAVAN,
   KANTHALOOR, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.KALEESWARAM RAJ

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
   SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
   DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, SECRETARIATE,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVT. PLEADER SHRI. BIJOY CHANDRAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 12/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K. DENESAN, J.

= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
W.P.(C) No. 8061 OF 2007 I
= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =

Dated this the 12th March, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The petitioners are Agricultural Assistants. They aspire for promotion to the post of Agricultural Officer. In the select list prepared in the year 2006 the petitioners' names also were included. They had passed the requisite test qualifications in 2001 and 2002. Since sufficient number of vacancies did not arise in the year concerned, the petitioners were not appointed despite their inclusion in the select list. In the select list subsequently prepared others who did not find a place in the select list for the previous year have been placed above the names of the petitioners. This has given rise to grievance for the petitioners. By filing Exts. P9 to P15 representations addressed to the 2nd respondent, the petitioners have taken steps to get their grievances redressed. The above representations are in fact filed against the finalisation of Exts. P7 and P8 lists prepared by the Commission and circulated by the 2nd respondent.

2. One of the contentions urged by the petitioners is based on the decision of this Court in ***Mohanan Nair***

v. ***State of Kerala*** {2005 (2) KLT 1014}.

3. Counsel for the petitioners submits that delay in disposing of Exts. P9 to P15 as also delay in finalising Exts. P7 and P8 will adversely affect the service prospects of the petitioners. It is also contended that finalisation, if any, done without looking into the contentions urged by the petitioners will cause irreparable injury to them.

4. I have heard Govt. Pleader for the respondents.

5. In the nature of the contentions urged in the aforesaid representations, it is only appropriate that the 2nd respondent takes early decision on those representations. Needless to state that rules as also judgments referred to therein shall be adverted to before passing orders on Exts. P9 to P15. A time limit of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment is fixed for the above purpose.

The petitioners shall produce a copy of the judgment and a copy of the writ petition before the 2nd respondent for information and necessary action.

K.K. DENESAN
JUDGE

jan/